

Date: Wed, 1 Sep 93 04:30:14 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #315
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 1 Sep 93 Volume 93 : Issue 315

Today's Topics:

 Frequency Forum
 I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah (4 msgs)
 So I learned the code. Big deal! (2 msgs)
 Updating the test (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 31 Aug 93 16:38:00 GMT
From: blkcat!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Frequency Forum
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

The Frequency Forum Bulletin Board System in Vienna, VA now carries
this UseNet newsgroup.

Jack Anderson, Sysop

Internet: janderson@ram.net
(alternate) jack.anderson@f239.n109.z1.fidonet.org

 --*-SCANNER BBS for VA, MD, DC!--*-
 --*-The Frequency Forum--*(703) 207-9622--*-9600/V.32/MNP--*-
--*-Files, Frequencies and Discussion for Scanner Hobbyists/Radio Amateurs--*

* SLMR 2.1a *

Date: 30 Aug 93 16:51:39 EDT
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, chdaley@news.delphi.com (CHDALEY@DELPHI.COM) writes:
>If we are going to continue this debate, lets come up with a method where
>all of the licenseholders are required to demonstrate this proficiency on
>a regular basis (annually???)
>
>Otherwise, let's just give it a rest.

I vote for the latter.

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League |
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111

Date: 31 Aug 93 14:42:37 GMT
From: butch!rapnet!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <25lpek\$ktc@chnews.intel.com> mgustoff@mstcsh.uucp (My Box) writes:
>From: mgustoff@mstcsh.uucp (My Box)
>Subject: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah
>Date: 27 Aug 1993 20:05:40 GMT

>=====

>!I think the point really is that the 13-20 WPM as a REQUIREMENT for HF
>!work is a silly and does not seem to fit in the "real" world. I have had
>!my ticket since Feb. and am proud to say NO, I will not learn the code past
>!5 WPM. But I still want HF access, I should not be shut out. But thats not
>!to say that I feel it should be eliminated, only as a requirment.
>!
>=====

> But I want a car to drive around the streets, but I shouldn't have to
> have insurance.

A lotta stuff deleted:

> Life is made up of challenges, accept those you wish and ignore those that
> are unattainable to you (even be proud of those if you like). Personally,

> I have pride in people who face up to and meet challenges, and not those
> that are looking for hand-outs all the time.

> Maybe you would enjoy your HF phone access on 27mHZ. I'm pretty sure there's
> an "I WANT" net that meets weekly on channel 23.

Nope..... They are on 27.505 and up...a whole bunch of HF WannaBees.
The sad part is that you sometimes can match voices heard on the WannaBee
band with some novice calls heard around 28.320. Some guys can't learn
Code, some can't dance. Others can't ride bikes. Just another acquired
skill and that takes a little effort and personal motivation...sad commentary
on today's gang. Even sadder is that it's fun and they are so wrapped
around the axle carping about why they shouldn't have to learn Morse they
waste half their life away and miss out.

KC1SG

Date: 30 Aug 93 21:57:11
From: korie1!newscast.West.Sun.COM!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!exodus.Eng.Sun.COM!
appserv.Eng.Sun.COM!appserv!rfm@ames.arpa
Subject: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Xwo39B4w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert@amanda.jpunix.com (robert)
writes:

mgustoff@mstcsh.uucp (My Box) writes:

> =====
> !I think the point really is that the 13-20 WPM as a REQUIREMENT for HF
> !work is a silly

I think this pretty well sums up the current "no-code" attitude.
Why is it that a significant minority of Americans are afraid of
putting forth effort, and think that everything should be handed
to them of a silver platter?

I at least have no particular fear of putting forth effort. What
I don't want to do is spend a bunch on what, to me, is worthless.
If you just want "effort" how about allowing me to substitute
riding a 100K bike ride instead? It's a fair amount of effort,
is very relevant to a ham operating style that interests me
(bike mobile.)

Rich

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

Date: Tue, 31 Aug 93 07:51:32 CDT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!
math.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jim Jaskie <jim_jaskie@tempeqm.sps.mot.com> writes:

> In article <y2s39B5w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert,

> robert@amanda.jpunix.com writes:

> >I second the motion.

>

>

> I third the motion. How about a vote?

I think the League would call exception to my vote.

After all, I'm not a member. Ho hum.

--Robert

Date: 31 Aug 93 21:48:11 GMT

From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!jmaynard@uunet.uu.net

Subject: So I learned the code. Big deal!

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Aug31.181737.3374@pixar.com> bruce@mongo.Com (Bruce Perens)
writes:

>But I'd still like to give you a bit of a hard time :-). Why don't you get a
>computer, and learn to operate and program it and fix it when it breaks the
>way I did? Why don't you learn how to build a microprocessor system on a
>breadboard and how to solder surface-mount components? Why not put up a TNC
>and hook in to a TCP/IP network from your mobile the way I did when I was a
>code-free technician? Then, you'd be a real ham! :-)

This anti-no-code Extra has done all of that. We're not all Luddites.

Good luck on your Extra test, Bruce...

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can

jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.
"iHaTeX." -- Andrew Burt

Date: 31 Aug 93 22:33:30 GMT
From: ogicse!cs.uoregon.edu!sgiblab!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!
perry@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: So I learned the code. Big deal!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Bruce Perens (bruce@mongo.Com) wrote:
: I was a code-free Technician for a whole month. I've now passed the 20 WPM
: test and Advanced theory, and will be going for my Extra theory exam in 10
: days.

Nice job!

: So I've learned the code. I've learned it better than most of you. Big deal!
: I've not had a single CW QSO, and I don't plan to have one when I'm an Extra.

Me too. However, I did a few CW QSOs just to say that I could.

: But I'd still like to give you a bit of a hard time :-). Why don't you get a
: computer, and learn to operate and program it and fix it when it breaks the
: way I did? Why don't you learn how to build a microprocessor system on a
: breadboard and how to solder surface-mount components? Why not put up a TNC
: and hook in to a TCP/IP network from your mobile the way I did when I was a
: code-free technician? Then, you'd be a real ham! :-)

Been there, done that, doing more. :-) You're real.

: Bruce Perens KD60TD/AA

If anyone's keeping track, I'm anti-no-5wpm for the treaty's sake.
However, I'll entertain motions on replacing 1B and 1C.

Perry Sott
AA0ET

Date: 31 Aug 93 08:37:08 GMT
From: ogicse!flop.ENG.RST.EDU!gaia.ucs.orst.edu!umn.edu!lynx.unm.edu!

hydra.unm.edu!news-user@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Updating the test
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Aug27.172422.163361@locus.com>,
Dana H. Myers <dana@lando.la.locus.com> wrote:
>CW is not proven to keep riff-raff out of the amateur service. Witness me,
>witness the 14.313 debacle, witness the 7.255 WesCARS jamming, witness
>all manner of rude and obnoxious operating for at least the last 16 years.
>I operate 2m on a daily basis in the Los Angeles area; in my own experience,
>the quality of ham radio has not changed significantly since the 5WPM
>requirement was dropped from the Tech license.

As was pointed out elsewhere, laws against murder aren't proven to prevent
it; do we toss those, too?

>> 1. It's unfairly weighted. As my elmer pointed out to me (before
>> my novtech test) if you KNOW subelements A-D, you have 15 of 19
>> already. Just GUESS any 4 from E-I (4 out of 10 of a multiple-
>> choice test- not TOO hard:) and you have it! But copy one
>> character less than required or miss 4 of 10 questions- you're sunk.
>
>I'm not sure I accept this logic.

ok

>
>Yup. Keep in mind, just cause something is outdated isn't enough. We need
>to actively emphasize the new things...

>
>--

> * Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are
*
> * (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily
*
> * dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
> * This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Which was my primary point: WHAT should we "actively emphasize?" If we
do eliminate or deemphasize code, what happens to the test? What
questions and test of some level of practical proficiency should fill the
gap?

Keith Smith KC5CEA
This Tech+ supports 13 and 20 WPM, even though he hasn't passed them yet!

Date: 31 Aug 93 23:05:54 GMT

From: ogicse!uwm.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!

perry@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: Updating the test

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Rick Aldom (ayka60@email.sps.mot.com) wrote:

: In article <CCFzE1.Fu1@fc.hp.com> Perry Scott, perry@fc.hp.com writes:
: >2. Applicant seriousness. It took me about 48 hours of study to go from
: > 5 to 13 wpm and another 48 for 13 to 20 wpm. Any proposal should
: > have sufficient challenge built in so as not to give away licenses.

: Tell me why I must demonstrate my "seriousness"? Other than infringing
: on the rights of others why should I be more or less serious than the
: next guy?? I may want nothing more than to talk to some other country
: once a month.

This isn't about rights, it's about obtaining rank and commensurate privilege. We don't award Eagle to any scout that shows up at the troop meeting. The Masons don't start a level 21. A priest doesn't start at Pope. Nobody forces you to be an Eagle, a 21st Mason, or the Pope. They are all voluntary positions which are respected because of the effort required to get there.

There is a psychological principle involved here. If something is difficult to obtain, people tend to not trash it when they get it. We're talking about a limited resource - frequency spectrum - so obtaining it should require some seriousness. Note that I am not advocating high-speed CW as the only measure of seriousness.

: >4. Fairness#2. Let's not weight this too far toward academia. We need
: > to give the 12 yr olds a chance at Extra.

: The point here is to try to ascertain the level of competence. If a 12
: yr old has learned enough to operate the station without:
: A. burning down the house
: B. annoying the neighbors
: C. Interfering with the local PD or other EMS agencies (out of band
: emissions).
: D. annoying other hams on the band by causing willful interference.
: E. being out of band or over powered.

A thru E are base level requirements to obtain a Novice license. Those who demonstrate higher levels of competence are (and should be) given access to more resources.

I don't understand how competence relates to Fairness#2. Fairness#2 is meant to counterbalance the written (academic) tests with a practical (or hands-on) test of relevant technology, procedure, or whatever that directly relates to amateur radio. (Sorry, I don't think biking 100 miles qualifies. :-)

Perry Scott
AA0ET

Date: 31 Aug 93 23:40:46 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!
perry@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <25j7tg\$elk@hydra.unm.edu>, <CCFzE1.Fu1@fc.hp.com>, <25to93\$oh1@hp-col.col.hp.com>ry
Subject : Re: Updating the test

Mike Stansberry (jms@col.hp.com) wrote:
: Perry Scott (perry@fc.hp.com) wrote:
: : 5. VEC integrity. The CW test is graded by 3 VEs. The proposal must
: : be gradeable by 3 VEs OF's that may not know what they are grading.
: : ^^^^

: Why do many people that post replies feel the need to 'slam' other folks?
: I find the term 'OF' offensive and I'm not sure if I fit into the mold
: or not.

I'm sorry you find the term "OF" offensive, it wasn't meant to be.

My definition of OF is someone who doesn't know, doesn't want to learn, and gripes when someone else talks about it. It's more an attitude than a physical age. In that respect, I'm a 35 yr old OF when it comes to DSPs. I don't know the first (well, second) thing about them, I don't want to learn, and feel they're terribly overrated.

Back to the point, if we introduce alternative practical tests, we'll have to assume that not all VEs know the subject material.

: With the new grading templates for the
: written tests, almost anyone could grade the tests, so it doesn't seem
: that one needs to know much to grade tests.

In this context, I'm talking about practical tests and NOT yet another

written test. For example, a proposed DSP test could have the applicant implement a filter program with an arbitrary pass function. Then we hook it up to a signal generator and listen to it. (This is probably too hard, but it's an example for grading).

The problem with translating a practical test into a written test is that it can change what you are testing. For example, the current CW test favors the Wheel-of-Fortune(tm)er and those that are good at multiple-choice tests. On the other end of the spectrum, the draconian FCC test that didn't let you fix up the copy sheet examines more of the CW-copying behavior.

: Mike Stansberry
: KØTER
: (ARRL VE)

Perry

Date: Tue, 31 Aug 1993 13:03:27 GMT
From: usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!ddsw1!chinet!megabyte@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <25lpek\$ktct@chnews.intel.com>, <joer.746497518@zen.DEV.3Com.COM>, <CCG8H1.IGJ@news.hawaii.edu>~
Subject : Re: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah

In article <CCG8H1.IGJ@news.hawaii.edu>,
Jeff Herman <jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu> wrote:
>But their arguments contain a major flaw: there are no problems in the
>CW subbands; there is no intentional interference, no profanity, no

>The CW operators are true gentlemen. I dare any of you to listen to

All this proves is that users of CW have these qualities. However, there is no quarrel about the "goodness" of CW operators, rather the requirement to pass a code test is the controversy.

Both the mess on 14.313 and the relative calmness of the CW bands prove the same thing: Passing the CW code test has nothing to do how polite or how good an operator you are.

--

"It is a pity that even a single drop of this noble
gift of God should be spilled" - J.S. Bach on wine
Mark E. Sunderlin: Technocrat in Winchester, VA KD4HRI
aka Dr. Megabyte: megabyte@chinet.chinet.com (703) 722-9330

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #315
